



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

80

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/928,925	08/13/2001	Shepherd S.B. Shi	044935.0000/2	8037

7590 05/20/2005

Joseph Chung
Foxconn International, Inc.
1650 Memorex Drive
Santa Clara, CA 95050

EXAMINER

BAYARD, DJENANE M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2141

DATE MAILED: 05/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/928,925

Applicant(s)

SHI ET AL.

Examiner

Djenane M. Bayard

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-3 and 5-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 4 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to amendment filed on 2/030/05 in which claims 1-20 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. As per claims 1 and 8, Applicant argues that the data object and the action are validated on the server based upon the synchronization request message and business logic defined by a user of the wireless computing device, corresponding to a domain of the data object. However, LaRue clearly wherein “the sync client performs a method for sending changes to the sync engine. Thus, for example if a user used the data application to change the telephone number of a person for whom data is stored in the dataset, then the sync client will send the new telephone number to the synch engine for incorporation into the dataset” (See col. 17, lines 33-45).

Furthermore, Applicant argues that the data object and the action are validated on the server based upon the synchronization request message and business logic defined by the user of the wireless computing device, corresponding to a domain of the data object. Applicant’s t arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2141

4. Claims 1, 2, 5-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,810,405 to LaRue et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,643,669 to Novak et al.

a. As per claim 1, LaRue et al teaches a method of database synchronization between a first database on a server and a second, corresponding database on a wireless computing device, comprising the steps of generating on a wireless computing device a synchronization request message, (The sync client performs a method for sending changes to the sync engine); transmitting the synchronization request object from the wireless computing device to a server (See col. 17, lines 49-67); validating the data object and the action on the server based upon the synchronization request message and business logic, defined by a user of the wireless computing device, corresponding to a domain of the data object (See and col. 18, lines 1-9) (The sync engine completes conflict and duplicate resolution); updating a remote data storage on the server based upon the business logic (See col. 19, lines 65-67 and col. 20, lines 1-10) (the sync engine enters changes from the sync client); generating a synchronization response message on the server based on results corresponding to the validating and the updating step; transmitting the synchronization response message from the server to the mobile computing device (See col. 20, lines 15-24) (the synch engine sends an action ACK Records object for each change received); and updating a data storage on the wireless computing device based upon the synchronization response message (See col. 21, lines 4-39) (The synch client enters the changes received). However, Larue et al fails to teach wherein the synchronization request message a data object and an action executed on the data object.

Art Unit: 2141

Novak et al teaches a method for optimization of synchronization between a client's database and a server database. Furthermore, Novak et al teaches wherein the synchronization request message a data object and an action executed on the data object (See col. 2, lines 51-60).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the synchronization request message a data object and an action executed on the data object as taught by Novak et al in the claimed invention of LaRue et al in order to minimize the amount of time for the synchronization process to utilize system resources (See col. 1, lines 51-55).

b. As per claims 8 and 15, LaRue et al teaches a method of verifying an action taken on a data object stored on a local data storage of a wireless computing device, comprising the steps of: generating a synchronization request message on a wireless computing device, (See col. 18, lines 30-54); transmitting the synchronization request message from the wireless computing device to a server(See col. 17, lines 49-67); processing the copy of the data object on a remote data storage on the server based upon business logic corresponding to a domain of the data object and defined by a user of the wireless computing device (See col. 18, lines 50-65 and col. 19-1-67) (The Sync engine performs conflict resolution and duplicate resolution before updating its dataset on the data received from the synch client).However, LaRue et al fails to teach wherein the synchronization request message includes a copy of a data object on a local data storage, an action that has been taken on the data object, and an old data object corresponding to the data object prior to when the action was taken.

Art Unit: 2141

Novak et al teaches a method for optimization of synchronization between a client's database and a server database. Furthermore, Novak et al teaches wherein the synchronization request message includes a copy of a data object on a local data storage, an action that has been taken on the data object, and an old data object corresponding to the data object prior to when the action was taken (See col. 3, lines 57-67 and col. 4, lines 1-11).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate wherein the synchronization request message includes a copy of a data object on a local data storage, an action that has been taken on the data object, and an old data object corresponding to the data object prior to when the action was taken.

c. As per claims 2, 13 and 19, LaRue et al teaches wherein the wireless computing device is a personal digital assistant (PDA) (See col. 5, lines 13-15)

d. As per claim 5, LaRue et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, LaRue et al teaches wherein the synchronization request message includes an old data object corresponding to the data object prior to the execution of the action and the validating step comprises the step of: comparing the old data object to a second data object, in the remote data storage, corresponding to the data object (See col. 20, lines 24-30).

e. As per claim 6, LaRue et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, LaRue et al teaches wherein the synchronization response message includes the

Art Unit: 2141

copy of the data object if the old data object does not match the copy of the data object (See col. 21, lines 51-60).

f. As per claims 7, 12 and 18, LaRue et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, LaRue et al teaches wherein the synchronization request message includes a first timestamp corresponding to a time the action was executed on the data object and the validating step comprises the step of: comparing the first timestamp with a second timestamp on a second data object, stored in the remote data storage, corresponding to the data object (See col. 3, lines 35-40 and col. 18, lines 30-54).

g. As per claims 9 and 16, LaRue et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, LaRue et al teaches generating on the server a synchronization response message based upon a result of the processing step; transmitting the synchronization response message to the wireless computing device; and, resetting the data object to the value of the old data object if the synchronization response message indicates that the processing step was not successful; or setting a status corresponding to the data object to a value of "updated" if the synchronization response message indicates that the processing step was successful (See col. 3, lines 42-64).

h. As per 10, LaRue et al teaches the claimed invention as described above. Furthermore, LaRue et al teaches the processing step comprising the steps of: validating the copy of the data object; and, if the validation is successful, updating a second data object, in the data storage of the server, corresponding to the data object (See col. 19, lines 65-67 and col. 20, lines 1-14).

Art Unit: 2141

i. As per claims 11 and 17, LaRue et al teaches the claimed invention as described above.

Furthermore, LaRue et al teaches wherein the step of: comparing the old data object to the second data object (See col. 19, lines 16-55).

j. As per claims 14 and 20, LaRue et al teaches the claimed invention as described above.

Furthermore, LaRue et al teaches wherein the wireless computing device is a computer (See col. 5, lines 13-15).

5. Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over No. 6,810,405 to LaRue et al in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,643,669 to Novak et al as applied to claims 1, 8 and 15 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent Application No. 2003/0069874 to Hertzog et al.

a. As per claim 3, LaRue et al in view of Novak teaches the claimed invention as described above. However, LaRue et al in view of Novak fails to teach prior to the transmission step, determining whether or not the wireless computing device is in a on-line mode or an off-line mode; and if the wireless computing device is in a on-line mode, proceeding to the transmitting the synchronization request message step; or if the wireless computing device is in a off-line mode, placing the synchronization request message into a synchronization queue; and proceeding to the transmitting the synchronization request message step once the wireless computing device is in the on-line mode.

Hertzog et al teaches a method and system to automate the updating of personal information within a personal information management application and to synchronize such updated personal information management information. Furthermore, Hertzog et al teaches prior to the transmission step, determining whether or not the wireless computing device is in a on-line mode or an off-line mode; and if the wireless computing device is in a on-line mode, proceeding to the transmitting the synchronization request message step; or if the wireless computing device is in a off-line mode, placing the synchronization request message into a synchronization queue; and proceeding to the transmitting the synchronization request message step once the wireless computing device is in the on-line mode (See page 4, paragraph [0051] and page 5, paragraph [0057]).

It would have been obvious to one with ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate prior to the transmission step, determining whether or not the wireless computing device is in a on-line mode or an off-line mode; and if the wireless computing device is in a on-line mode, proceeding to the transmitting the synchronization request message step; or if the wireless computing device is in a off-line mode, placing the synchronization request message into a synchronization queue; and proceeding to the transmitting the synchronization request message step once the wireless computing device is in the on-line mode as taught by Hertzog et al in order to detect when the client machine establishes a connection to the network and trigger a global synchronization operation (See page 4, paragraph [0052]).

Allowable Subject Matter

Art Unit: 2141

6. Claim 4 objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion


7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Djenane M Bayard whose telephone number is (703) 305-6606. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday- Friday 5:30 AM- 3:00 PM..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (703) 305-4003. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Djenane Bayard

Patent Examiner



RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER